

Date: Sun, 15 May 94 04:30:11 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #205  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sun, 15 May 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    205

Today's Topics:

        FCC/VE exams overseas - problems?  
        Question abt Digital Modulation Legality  
        Question Pool - Where?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: Sun, 15 May 1994 09:52:32 +0000  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!doc.ic.ac.uk!uknet!demon!g8sjp.demon.co.uk!  
ip@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: FCC/VE exams overseas - problems?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <slayCpru2x.Dty@netcom.com> slay@netcom.com "Sandy Lynch" writes:

> Potential flaws in the VE Exam system??  
>  
> A question was raised recently as to whether or not non-citizens of  
> the USA are eligible for US ham licenses; they are. The question  
> reminded me of one of the peculiarities of the current VE system.  
> The bottom line is that it seems possible for the following to occur:  
>  
>     1. US exam sessions can and do occur outside of the USA.  
>         (i.e. out of direct US legal jurisdiction)

Actually, I don't see any (particular) relevance to \*who's\* legal jurisdiction  
a VE session is held under. In the final analysis, the VE's are directly

answerable to their VEC, and also by definition to the FCC. Geography isn't an issue.

- > 2. The "question pool" can (I think) be translated into a foreign
- > language (i.e. non-English). I see no requirement that says
- > the language of the exam MUST be English, nor that any translation
- > MUST be certified or accredited by the VECs or the FCC. The
- > requirement "may" exist, but I haven't seen it, yet.

Like yourself, I see no requirement for the exam to be in English. If that ~~were~~ the case, all the question pools would be invalid :-)

- > 3. "Accredited" VEs can be non-US citizens/permanent residents.

True. What of it?

- > 4. Applicants can be non-US citizens/permanent residents.

True. What of it? Perhaps we should examine the motivation behind an application by a non-US citizen for an FCC Amateur license. It is my understanding that a large number of these are, in fact, British. And the profile of these applicants is interesting, too.

On the whole, they will have already qualified (some time ago) for either a U.K. Amateur Licence 'A' or 'B' - with 'A' being roughly equivalent to General, but also including a 12 WPM code sending test. The 'B' licence requires the same passes in the written papers, but does not include any code requirements. Nearly the same as a Technician, but not quite :-)

As you will know, on an annual basis, the U.K. exports quite a lot of a) money and b) tourists to Florida and California (plus some other places), and a number of these will be amateur radio enthusiasts, who would find the availability of a dual band HT an useful asset on their trip(s) to the U.S.

All these folks have to do is to file a Form 610A and apply for a reciprocal permit (actually, it says an Alien permit, but we're fresh out of UFO's right now ...). The ~~problem~~ with that strategy is this: that permit is valid for one (rather than ten) year, and allows the operator privileges which he ~~would~~ have on his home soil, where these are less than or equal to those privileges available to an equivalent U.S. license class. For U.K. amateurs this means: 50-52MHz, 144-146MHz, ~~no~~ 220MHz, 430-431MHz, 432-440 MHz. I'm sure if you consider what these allocations mean, you'll realise that a reciprocal permit is in fact less than useful to a British amateur.

- > 5. Successful applicants can receive US licenses without ever once
- > setting foot on US soil; that is, being directly subject to US
- > legal jurisdiction.

Yes, that can happen. but *\*why\** would it happen? Let's assume that I have a desire to spend 3 months travelling the U.S. for a vacation. When I arrive, I'd like to buy an R.V. and install a mobile rig in order to chat to local folks whilst on my travels. Given the frequency restrictions (necessarily) imposed by the reciprocal permit, it would be really useful if I had a "proper" FCC license when I arrived on U.S. soil. Yes - I *\*know\** that there are frequent walk-in testing sessions, but with the turn-around time at the VEC/FCC, and the fact that I'm (notionally) planning to be on the move the whole time, how do I obtain a license if I don't arrive with it already in my possession?

> Question: How many other countries in the world would permit foreign  
> nationals, on foreign soil, to administer exams for amateur licenses  
> (or any other license) in, potentially, a foreign language without  
> the requirement to have "approved" translations? Think of it. There  
> is absolutely nothing that the FCC nor the US law enforcement or judicial  
> system can do .... except maybe revoke somebody's license. No penalties,  
> no potential jail terms, etc.

Well ... there is an interesting, if not contentious question! I can't speak meaningfully about the licensing strategy of countries other than the U.S. and the U.K., but .... The U.K. Radiocommunications Agency (FCC-equivalent) grants franchises for amateur licensing testing to "appropriate applicants". This is probably effectively an identical strategy to that employed by the FCC, who have seen fit (under their rule making processes) to grant a number of franchises to various VEC organizations. Here in the U.K., there are only two such organizations - the R.S.G.B. have the franchise for supplying Morse code testing, while the City and Guilds of London Institute have the franchise for the written testing. The result? On almost any given day, you could go somewhere in the U.K. and take a code test, with the proviso that you would *\*usually\** be expected to book in advance (around one month). The written tests are a different, sad story. You'll need to book many months in advance, for one of only *\*two\** (or is it three??) dates in the year, for a test at a restricted number of sites.

What would make life fun would be this: when the C&G's franchise expires, the ARRL (and possibly W5YI) ought to apply to take it over. As I understand it, the decision criteria is based only upon the suitability of the examination syllabus. It is my belief that, on the basis of the VEC program's success, that the U.K. authorities might well be persuaded to adopt this approach.

> Discussion:  
> BEFORE anybody gets excited and thinks I am xenophobic on this, I'm just  
> raising the subject as a matter of "potential" abuse. I have coordinated  
> quite a number of ARRL/VEC test sessions in Japan - and yes - I've also  
> used a Japanese VE. (Never mind that this fellow is/was also instrumental  
> in facilitating "reciprocal licenses"). And, my XYL took the exam (not  
> from me) even though she was/is not a US citizen nor permanent resident.

Well, a story with a happy ending :-) I'm not a U.S. citizen. I am an ARRL accredited Extra Class VE. I took my tests in Rochester, NY. What is it about that you think could bring abuse into any test sessions at which I serve? In any case, I'm sure that the immigration folks would take me to one side and attempt to hold a deep and meaningful discussion on the subject of any misdemeanours I may be accused of upon my arrival in the U.S. for one of my frequent business trips :-)

> I am also aware that in Europe CEPT licenses are available to citizens  
> (and maybe others?) of the European Community to operate thruout the EC.  
> That's NOT exactly the same as having Germans giving exams in Germans  
> for individuals to receive FRENCH operator/station licenses, is it?

Actually, a CEPT license is more of a "reciprocal without paperwork" than what you've imagined. A few extracts from the rules, as applied to U.K. licensees:

"CEPT Amateurs shall comply with the terms of their CEPT equivalent licence, unless such compliance would result in a breach of the requirements of the United Kingdom."

and

"CEPT Amateurs who possess the equivalent of a CEPT Class 2 licence shall use only those frequencies above 144MHz ....."

and

"The licensee shall be a temporary visitor and non-resident in the host country ..."

I've already discussed the U.K. franchise situation. Let's put the boot on the other foot for a few moments. Here, the code tests are organized by the R.S.G.B., who have appointed a number of Senior Morse Examiners - one for each county (London is an exception - it is further divided into North and South). These folks are described as "Senior County Morse Examiners". The qualifications necessary for this "job" (it's a volunteer position ...) are simple: 100% copy of 5 minutes at minimum 20 WPM. 100% sending for 5 minutes at 12 WPM on a straight key. Applicants must have a suitable disposition towards their task and the test candidates. Morse examiners are not required to be British citizens. Morse examiners are not required to be British residents. Morse examiners are not required to hold an amateur radio license of \*any\* description. Morse examiners are not required to be members of the R.S.G.B. Simple.

Thereafter, it is the responsibility of the Senior County Morse Examiner to recruit and select appropriate "County Morse Examiners", according to identical selection criteria. In order to gain a "pass" for the U.K. code test, there have to be two examiners present, who must agree that you "made the grade". A simple, effective process. As you can see, the Senior County Examiner has a lot of latitude to abuse the testing process if he/she should desire to.

So ... where's this all lead? Up until a few weeks ago, one of our Senior Morse Examiners was an American citizen. He's now finished his assignment here in the U.K. and returned home. How do you suppose, in the event that we discover he had abused our system, we could hold him accountable? Well, we couldn't - simple as that. I'm not bothered, either. And I'm not bothered for these reasons:

- \* I can read and send Morse code far in excess of the requirements to be a U.K. Senior Morse Examiner
- \* I *am* a U.K. Senior Morse Examiner (adjoining county)
- \* I personally knew this chap, and trusted his integrity

> Another point is that in some countries (i.e. Japan), a Japanese citizen  
> with an Extra Class license from the USA will be automatically eligible  
> to receive a 1st Class Japanese license ..... even though the Japanese  
> exam is considerably more difficult from both the technical AND CW  
> requirement perspective. So, a situation can/may develop whereby  
> JA operators (among the finest in the world, I might add), may flock to  
> VE sessions in Japan and sign up for calls in KH6, KH0, KH2, etc. This  
> is not altogether bad ..... but there has been some discussion of late  
> concerning "Vanity Calls" in the USA and how residents of Hawaii have  
> discovered that all the "prime" extra class calls have been allocated ...  
> ... and many of those to non-Hawaii residents (mainlanders and foreigners).

But where are they going to use these KHx calls? I have zero idea of the license regulations in JA-land. But I do know that if I attempted to sign G/N2TLY, it wouldn't be long before the radio police jumped on me, asking to see my reciprocal permit. Of course, they will *not* issue reciprocal permits to British citizens ...

> My personal perspective is that reciprocal licensing should be made as  
> "universal" as possible. I would much rather be JA1/WA6BXH rather than  
> the fairly unique 7J1ABV - which also is distinctive to foreign hams only.  
> However, there is a certain amount of appeal and prestige felt by many  
> hams overseas (this I KNOW) who take great pride in collecting the  
> wallpaper (foreign license) that they will never actually use.

I agree with your perspective. However, we are not even off of the starting grid yet .... CEPT, as I have demonstrated, is a paperwork reduction exercise rather than a universal license. I have a number of calls for different parts of the world. Each call I hold has been activated (at some time or other) in the country it was issued for. I wouldn't have it any other way - the associated paperwork and processes are just too difficult otherwise!

> Is this a problem? Should anything be done about it?  
> I raise the issue simply as a discussion topic. I am not necessarily  
> advocating a particular position, nor am I offering a solution (yet).  
> I am just curious to see if there is any interest in the topic.

In my opinion, no, and no.

--

Iain Philipps

-----

Date: Fri, 13 May 1994 09:56:44 -0400  
From: ftpbox!mothost!lmpsbbs!NewsWatcher!user@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Question abt Digital Modulation Legality  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <jernandez-110594084605@jernandez.pbs.org>, jernandez@pbs.org  
(John J. Hernandez) wrote:

>  
> Are modulation formts like QPSK,QAM,or GMSK permitted in the amateur  
> VHF/UHF and microwave bands? If so, what part of the Rules&Regs cover this  
> topic?  
>

John, the Amateur Radio Service rules & regs are Part 97. The specific  
sections that you will want to read are:

97.305 Authorized emission types  
97.307 Emission Standards  
97.309 RTTY and Data emission codes

The FCC regulates the bandwidth and "language," but not the specific  
modulation format of data transmissions. Thus you can send a message  
using GMSK on 223.500 MHz but you must use 5-level Murray with ITA#2,  
CCIR 476 or 625, or ANSI X3.4-1977. Note that 8-bit ASCII is NOT  
included, which technically disallows standard 8-bit binary file  
transfers. The symbol rate cannot exceed 56 kBps and the bandwidth  
cannot exceed 100 kHz

> Thanks in advance  
>  
> --  
> John J. Hernandez  
> Communication Systems Engineer  
> Public Broadcasting Service  
>  
> E-Mail jernandez@pbs.org      Member:PRR Technical & Historical Society  
> Phone: 703-739-5474              Southern Railway Historical Association  
> Amateur Radio: KA2YAP

--

Karl Beckman, P.E. < The difference between genius and stupidity >  
Motorola LMPs- Analog Data < is that genius has its limits. -Unknown >

The statements and opinions expressed here are not those of Motorola Inc.  
Amateur radio WA8NVW @ K8MR.NEOH.USA.NA NavyMARS VBH @ NOGBN.NOASI

-----

Date: 14 May 1994 16:28:06 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!gatech!news.ans.net!rainbow.sosi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Question Pool - Where?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hi all,

Is there by chance a FTP site where the latest question pool  
is kept for technician class license.

I am also looking for recommendations for a code practicing program.  
Windows version preferred.

Thanks

-----  
John P. Morphet jmorphet@asys.com  
Advanced Systems voice (719) 579-9014  
Colorado Springs, CO., USA fax (719) 579-9017  
-----

-----

Date: 13 May 1994 00:38:24 GMT  
From: parc!biosci!agate!kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU!kennish@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2qp6r0\$joh@news.nd.edu>, <hawley.768683905@aries>,  
<1994May12.150314.3237@eisner>, i  
Subject : Re: Newbie WARNING to fellow Newbies

In article <1994May12.150314.3237@eisner>,  
Michael D Brown <brown\_mi@eisner.decus.org> wrote:

>Although this discussion is better carried out in policies newsgroup, when I  
>was a ham in Indiana I was told to only have one ear covered. Also, at the

>time, it was STRONGLY recommended that we carry a photocopy of our license  
>with us at all times even if we had ham plates on the car. Sometimes that  
>little piece of paper with an FCC seal on it helps convince the local deputy  
>that you are legit.

>

>

>Mike

>KF9VC

Hmm... I think this recommendation is kinda moot, since we all follow  
the FCC rules to the letter, which states:

97.9 Operator license. - (a) There are 5 classes of operator licenses: Novice, Technician, General, Advanced and Amateur Extra. An operator license authorizes the holder to be the control operator of a station with the privileges of the operator class specified on the license. The license document or a photocopy thereof must be in the personal possession of the licensee at all times when the person is the control operator of a station.

Looks like driving a car or not, you have better have that little piece  
of paper with an FCC seal on it. The Candy Company may have a field  
day with you if you don't :-)

Ken

-----

Date: 14 May 94 16:06:10 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!  
BIX.com!hamilton@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994May13.195106.20824@mixcom.mixcom.com>,

<hamilton.768890953@BIX.com>, <1994May14.150450.15278@mixcom.mixcom.com>

Subject : Re: Code test speeds

kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>I am an EE involved in systems design and DSP. The issue is not what  
>is a challenge for EEs, but your post stating that there should be  
>even further code speed tests/amateur\_classes beyond 20 WPM. I  
>simply suggested that a little more emphasis on theory would be  
>more appropriate. Apparently even you, a fellow engineer, feel  
>the CW over theory mentality is well and good. Sorry I brought  
>up the subject.



No, that's not quite my position. What I'm saying is that I think the licensing tests should emphasize operating skills and only those technical skills directly supporting operations.

I'm told that in the early days of the automobile, to get a driver's license, one had to demonstrate the ability to repair the engine. We can laugh about that now, but at the time, it probably made sense, since cars of the time probably did break down constantly and if the driver couldn't fix it, you have to wonder who might be around who could.

OTOH, we do require (minimally, I admit) more operating skills today. Can you parallel park? Can you recognize the road signs? I doubt these were part of the test 80 years ago.

Amateur radio has gone thru a similar transformation from an age where if you didn't build it yourself, you didn't have it to one where most of the equipment is a maze of microprocessors, ASIC's and multilayer boards.

The technical skills that make sense to insist on today are not those related to circuit design. They are things like understanding bandwidth, coding techniques, propagation, EMI, safety & health, and fundamentals related to those few areas (such as antennas) where it is still practical (or even necessary, in case of emergency) for amateurs to routinely construct their own equipment. There should be a link between any requirement for theoretical credentials and the actual operations problems an amateur really will face.

When you and other complained about my suggestion for an "Extra-Extra" class, I think you focused too sharply on the possibility it might carry an even higher code requirement. That was only part of what I said. The other part was that it might also involve demonstration of special skills in emergency response.

As I said in another message, let's keep in mind this is the Amateur Radio Service and I believe we must take that third word seriously. Does it really matter whether anyone knows the difference between an NPN and a PNP? OTOH, I think it does matter whether any of us might be able to do the right thing in case of emergency. Would you be able to function as a net control? If you suddenly heard an emergency cry for help, how good would your response be? Would you get all the right information copied down (correctly!) and to the right people in seconds? or would it be minutes? If your life was in danger, would you feel safe if the guy on the other end had just exactly your level of preparedness?

Frankly, I admit I do not have the operating skills I'm describing here and my guess is that neither do most of us. Yet it is the operating skills, not the (minimal) technical abilities we could expect of an

amateur that justify our service. This is why I believe incentive licensing should focus on operations (and yes, including CW), not theory.

Regards,

Doug Hamilton KD1UJ hamilton@bix.com Ph 508-358-5715  
Hamilton Laboratories, 13 Old Farm Road, Wayland, MA 01778-3117, USA

-----  
Date: Sat, 14 May 1994 01:09:00 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!modem110.ucdavis.edu!  
ddtodd@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9405111559.AA00194@hwking.cca.rockwell.com>,  
<hamilton.768755278@BIX.com>, <1994May13.195106.20824@mixcom.mixcom.com>, £  
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>BTW, why are ALL the contests related to making contacts. Why  
>are there no theory contests? Why is ALL the prestige in amateur  
>radio associated with code, contacts and contests?

How about a contest where after a regular two day cantest instead of submitting your logs you submit the name and call of the ten best operators you contacted during the two days. this way the more contacts you make the greater your chances of winning, but you can't just exchange calls or the guy won't list you. The thing to do is to make brief, polite meaningful exchanges that are likely to get you on someone elses submissions. The person who shows up most often wins.

any takers?,  
Dan

=====  
Dan Todd ddtodd@ucdavis.edu kc6uud@ke6lw.#nocal.ca.us.na  
Charter Member: Dummies for UNIX

-----  
When radios are outlawed, only outlaws will have radios  
- David R. Tucker on rec.radio.amateur.policy  
=====

-----  
Date: 11 May 94 01:30:09 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!mixcom.com!  
kevin.jessup@ucbvax.berkeley.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2qfp70\$ppqq@proffa.cc.tut.fi>,  
<1994May9.133020.13253@mixcom.mixcom.com>, <2qneiu\$b67@proffa.cc.tut.fi>  
Subject : Re: Gilder's Concerns

In <2qneiu\$b67@proffa.cc.tut.fi> k23690@proffa.cc.tut.fi (Kein{nen Paul) writes:

>kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> wrote:

>> True. This assumes you are not allowed to change the "center frequency"  
>> about which you "spread" your signal.

>If you change your modulation parameters, you have to make sure that  
>every other station you are communicating with knows what you are doing.  
>You have to have constant full duplex contact with all station involved.  
>In a master/slave configuration (base station/mobile stations) this is  
>not a big problem, as only the base station has to know that you are  
>changing the modulation parameters, but in a round-table environment  
>(radio-LAN) you get a lot of problems.

Yes. A repeater makes a good master. Finding where it might  
be in it's spreading sequence or where it's  $\sin(x)/x$  curve originates  
would, however, pose a bit of a problem to those tuning in for the  
first time, but we'll get it figured out. :-))

For me, the most interesting aspect of SS is the synchronization/correlation  
problem.

>However, this soft limiting forces all services to reduce their  
>cell sizes, even if the traffic load for that particular service  
>would not justify reducing the cell size. Assuming that amateur  
>spread spectrum systems share a large SS-band (such as 900 MHz).  
>Can the amateur community build and maintain such a large number  
>of base stations in large cities, where there is a large demand  
>for commercial spread spectrum services and consequently, the cell  
>size has to be small.

Well, I cannot argue with that! Around here, some repeater clubs  
find simple remote receive sites just too complex! ;-)

>On HF the conditions are much more stable than in a microwave  
>mobile system and thus it should be easier to adopt some "smart"  
>system.

Some of us are already having HF QSO's using FH. Want our  
hopping sequence? So far, there are only five of us in the net.

The more the merrier. :-)))))

>However, I am afraid that the radio amateur community is not ready  
>for such "outrageous" ideas.

They're too busy learning code. Oops...there I go again. ;-))

Looks like we're the only ones in the discussion here. I was  
hoping some more would join in. Want to take it to Email??

```
--  
/`- _      kevin.jessup@mixcom.com  
{      }/    Marquette Electronics, Inc  
 \      /    N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio  
  |__*|    N9SQB @ WD9ANY.#MKE.WI.USA.NA
```

-----  
Date: 14 May 94 14:25:58 -0500  
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!news.tufts.edu!news.hnrc.tufts.edu!jerry@yale.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <hamilton.768755278@BIX.com>, <ddtodd.77.000D50FB@ucdavis.edu>,  
<hamilton.768924952@BIX.com>net  
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <hamilton.768924952@BIX.com>, hamilton@BIX.com (hamilton on BIX)  
writes:

> ddtodd@ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

>

>>No, that is not true, I worked on Super Morse for two months straight, 1/2  
>>and hour a day, every day, and I still can't copy 10 much less 13 wpm. And  
>>here I am with my advanced csce.

>

> I started with SuperMorse and I will say that it did work to help teach  
> me the individual characters. But beyond that initial step, it just  
> didn't work for me. It seemed like I was getting good at pressing keys  
> but without having any clue what the code was. It certainly wasn't  
> helping me develop any ability to copy on paper and know what I was  
> copying.

Just out of curiosity, which version? 4.10 generates random QSO with changing  
templates (e.g, one time it will be "My name is . . .", next time it might be  
"Name hr is . . . ", and other variants. Sometimes it's WX; other times  
"weather", and so on.)

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #205

\*\*\*\*\*